

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 250, AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO PROVIDE FOR GIFT REFORM

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-337) on the resolution (H. Res. 250) to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-338) on the resolution (H. Res. 267) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HILLIARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SECRETARY O'LEARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it appears that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are salivating at the chance to use a rumor against Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary.

Some of my Republican colleagues who are upset with Secretary O'Leary for not greasing their districts with sufficient Federal lard, are trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill as their revenge. Apparently the Wall Street Journal—not known to be a Democrat-friendly newspaper—wrote that the Secretary of Energy had hired an advanced news-clipping service to gauge what newspapers across the Nation and the world were saying about the Department which she is working to reform.

However, some of my bitter Republican colleagues who did not get the bacon they wanted from the DOE, are charging that Secretary O'Leary was spying on reporters, newspapers, and was concerned about the Department's image. What a farce.

This coming from Members of Congress who spend tens of thousands of dollars on their press secretaries who basically do the same thing: clip newspapers and respond

when they get bad press. This coming from Members of Congress who use the House recording studio, send out newsletters, get official photos et cetera, et cetera. My Republican colleagues are charging Secretary O'Leary with spending \$43,000 on what every major corporation in America does: monitor how the press is receiving them.

Yet when one compares how much Members of Congress spend on their press secretaries, news letters and so on, we will find that they spend much more than \$43,000 on image. Can you imagine the nerve of my colleagues who have the audacity to stand up here and accuse the Secretary of Energy of being concerned about the image of her Department, when they are doing the exact same thing?

One of my Republican colleagues from South Carolina even had the nerve to stand on the floor last night to lambaste Secretary O'Leary, and say, quote, "If I as a Member of Congress took taxpayer money entrusted to my care to go out and work on somebody to make me look better, I should lose my job."

Well, maybe my colleague from South Carolina should resign. What is your press secretary for if he or she is not there to spruce up your image? What is more unbelievable, is that that same colleague, just seconds before he delivered his rumor-based attack on Secretary O'Leary, said an I quote, "This is a funny town where rumors can start without any basis." He made this statement in defense of one of our Republican colleagues who has had charges leveled against him. Yet, literally in the same speech, he then went on to accuse Ms. O'Leary of abusing the public trust based solely on a rumor. So it appears that when rumors are started about Republicans, Washington all of the sudden becomes, "A funny town where rumors can start without any basis." However, if Republicans are the ones starting those rumors then it is OK.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of duplicity just amazes me. In fact, the Washington Post reported today that the Republican National Committee uses the exact same news-clipping service which the Republicans are claiming is a spy agency.

In fact, many corporations use such clipplings services. And since Hazel O'Leary has been trying to run DOE more like a business, it only makes sense that she have at her disposal the same tools that the corporations have at their disposal.

According to Mary McGrory in a Washington Post article on May 16, 1995, she said about Hazel O'Leary, and I quote, "No Cabinet officer has run a department more efficiently." In fact, for the DOE which has tens of thousands of employees, to spend \$45,000 on so-called image is actually pretty good when one considers what Members of Congress spend on image.

In closing I would advise my colleagues on the other side of the isle to be very careful before they start spreading rumors about a Cabinet member who didn't give them the pork projects they wanted in order to boost their images.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S CREDIBILITY CANYON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, tonight as the shadows descend from coast to coast, it is worth noting that life goes on in these United States, despite one cable network offering a countdown akin to a spacecraft countdown for the alleged shutdown of Government. Life continues.

Tonight again we are reminded that we have fateful choices to make, that we have significant differences of opinion; that, indeed, in many cases, we should rejoice in those differences, and we are certainly entitled to different interpretations.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that tonight it would be important to offer the rest of the story. As one of our commentators so eloquently puts it on radio on a daily basis, for example, I have the greatest respect and affection for my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP], from the other side of the aisle, who was just in here talking about a conservative Democrat balanced budget plan. I must say, indeed, that I welcome that initiative on the part of the conservatives on the other side of the aisle. There remain philosophical differences, but unfortunately, my friends who would call themselves conservative on the other side of the aisle are in fact a minority within a minority.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP], chose to characterize the outcome of the vote on his self-described conservative Democrat balanced budget plan, saying it was rejected by the majority, full disclosure demands and accurate counting of the vote.

The sad fact is, and I can understand my friend's frustration, the sad fact is that a majority of his own party rejected that plan, including the minority leader. There reaches a time, Mr. Speaker, where we cannot be content with those who would merely talk the talk. The people of the United States, in my opinion, have spoken clearly and compellingly that they want to see a change in the culture of endless taxation and spending, and yet leaders step forward, claiming one thing and oftentimes doing another.

I find it especially ironic that this Nation's Chief Executive, who made well known in his youth his opposition to some of the actions taken by the President of his party in the late 1960's, in fact, it was said of that President in the late 1960's that he suffered from a credibility gap, how unfortunate it is that our President tonight suffers from an affliction that can only be described as a credibility canyon, so wide is the gulf between what Bill Clinton, the candidate, said, Mr. Speaker, and what Bill Clinton, the President, is willing to deliver.

In 1992, then candidate Clinton, on national television, said that he would commit to balance this Nation's budget within 5 years. As President, Bill Clinton, earlier in this session of the 104th Congress, worked overtime on the

votes of six Members of the other body who voted for a balanced budget amendment in the 103d Congress. He applied Presidential pressure so they would change their votes and that a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution would fail.

In 1992, Mr. Speaker, candidate Clinton spoke of a tax cut for the middle class. Very early in his term, President Clinton gave us the largest tax increase in American history, a tax increase affecting virtually every American, for it was not only on income tax, it was not only retroactive, taxes increased also on gasoline that every American, virtually, buys.

Then, just a few weeks ago, perhaps suffering from the affliction that, Mr. Speaker, you so accurately described in your radio address of a few weeks ago, this overwhelming need for our chief executive, instead, to act as a campaigner in chief, the President went down to Houston. This is the article that appeared on the wires of the Reuters news agency, with an account of what transpired in Houston. "Clinton said he knew that a lot of people in the room were 'still mad about the 1993 budget,' and, in his words, 'they think I raised their taxes too much, it might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too.'"

Then the following day the President, in a press briefing, tried to make light of this assertion, saying that his mother advised him not to make speeches after 7 o'clock. I appreciate the President's attempt at humor. I guess there might be some effort to laugh, if it were not so serious and, fundamentally, if it were not so tragic. Where does the President stand?

People have quoted polls here. The most compelling poll or the most compelling polls are those turned in Election Day every 2 years to decide who serves in this Congress, every 4 years to decide who serves in the oval office. There comes a time, sooner or later, when we are called upon in this country to join together and to govern, and as the gentleman serving as our Speaker pointed out in his radio address of a few weeks ago, this President seems content playing the part of campaigner in chief, rather than Commander in Chief. Indeed, as our friend in the chair tonight made the point in his radio address, "Perhaps we ought to try and work on a constitutional amendment that would allow this President to be the campaigner in chief while we go look for a genuine chief executive to help us govern."

Things are not always as they seem. The cataclysm that many have spoken of that supposedly took place today with the alleged shutdown of government services has yet to be realized, and yet those apologists for more taxes and more spending came to the floor of this House today, and so great is their affinity for big government, they voted basically to allow the executive branch to raid the trust funds to keep the government in business.

H.R. 2621, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass, to prevent disinvestment of trust funds, 177 Members of the liberal minority voted no, saying, in essence, "Mr. President, Mr. Secretary of the Treasury, go ahead and raid those trust funds." The irony is compelling that those who march to the well of this House day after day and claim that they are the protectors of Social Security and they are the protectors of Medicare, and yet today when they are called upon to vote to protect the very trust funds they allegedly pledge an oath of fealty to, somehow they just cannot do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined on the floor tonight by two of my colleagues who are also new to this Chamber. I would first yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from the golden corner of South Carolina, Mr. LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am intrigued by what the gentleman is saying to the point where I came over here to join him. I just want to say this, I know people have heard a lot. On a good day, it is very difficult to deal with the issues in Congress because they are so huge. We have a \$4.9 trillion national debt. If any political figure tells you that it will be easy to come to a balanced budget, I do not think they are being honest with you, because this is hard work, but it has to be done with a certain sense of genuineness.

Let us talk about something you mentioned a few minutes ago about the President as a campaigner. I know you value and I know that JOHN values our personal integrity when we deal with our constituents. Bill Clinton, the campaigner, said that "I will submit to the Congress a 5-year balanced budget." He said that on "Larry King Live." As a candidate, he wanted to balance the budget in 5 years, because he knew even in 1992, that was an important issue to the American public. I have never seen that document. That document does not exist.

When he was on television trying to get elected, he said something that he thought would sound good that would help him get votes, but he did not mean it. I can guarantee you, if you think it is difficult to balance the budget in 7 years, it would be very difficult to balance it in 5 years. It is going to be difficult, no matter what. But he made a statement that "I am going to balance the budget in 5 years," never followed through with it, never sat down in a room to try to figure out the numbers, to make it a reality. He said it just because he thought it would sound good.

What happened when he got to be President? A couple of things happened. In November 1994, not one single Republican incumbent lost. There was a sweeping change in this country. I was the first Republican elected in my district in 120 years. My Republican freshman class consists of 73 very, very good, dedicated people that ran on the

same issues. We have taken our campaign literature and made overlays. The theme of it was "Bring back responsibility and control of Washington, DC's financial matters." That election sent a signal to Bill Clinton, and the polls were at 80, 82 percent that we want to balance the budget.

In response to that event, 2½ years after he has been President, he finally submits a balanced budget plan that is 10 years. The problem with a 10-year balanced budget plan is a couple things. One, it does not balance after 10 years. You have \$209 billion in deficits. But let me just show you how bad this plan was. He submitted it to the House, and the Democratic leadership was so embarrassed by it they would not even offer it for a vote in the House as a substitute. BOB DOLE submitted it to the Senate for a vote, and you know how many votes it got? Zero. He has never, ever genuinely thought of a way to balance the budget in 5 years or 10 years. Now he is saying maybe 9, 8, 7.

The only way we are going to get Bill Clinton to balance the budget is to make him. The only way to balance the budget is to affect entitlement spending. You do not have to cut, slow the growth down, pass the savings on to future generations, reform Medicare so it will be preserved for senior citizens, options that work, that work in the private sector. We are doing all those things, but it takes two to tango up here. We have a guy at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue that will say whatever he needs to say at the moment to get re-elected, and that is not why we got elected. That behavior is going to stop.

□ 2100

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great friend from South Carolina, and I am also pleased to see our very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], who joined us as one of the newcomers, one of the 73 conservative newcomers to this House.

Mr. FOX, welcome. I know that certain actions in Washington have been both disheartening and enlightening simultaneously for the gentleman.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and would say that would be certainly an understatement.

I want to say that we in the freshman class appreciate the gentleman's leadership. In fact, he has been a very active Member of the 104th Congress in trying to achieve the agenda the American public really wants. The balanced budget amendment has been discussed by the gentleman many times on this House floor, and as well by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

The fact is that by balancing the budget, we will help every family, those who have kids, those with seniors, because they will have more of their dollars back in their pocket and lessen the bureaucracy. What has not been discussed, at least tonight on the

floor, and I am glad we have the opportunity to do so, is that we have a culture here in Washington of creating a bureaucracy that has regulations that overregulate, overspend, and do not contribute one item to the preservation of good programs for the country but add to the cost of those programs, not in direct services.

I think it is also important to point out that not only is a balanced budget something all America wants, but most of the Contract With America had about 100 percent of the Republicans supporting it, but over 55 to 60 percent of the Democrats supporting it. It was failed to be recognized in earlier speeches by Members on the other side of the aisle, but regulatory reform will decrease the cost for businesses that duplicate existing state law.

Unfunded mandates, if we believe that we should have something from the Federal Government, that is something we should actually fund here from the Federal Government. The congressional accountability law, which was passed, was signed by the President, and the line item veto. All these things were supported strongly by Americans, even though Republicans were the ones that sponsored it and the Republicans were the ones that espoused it.

Frankly, with the balanced budget, and I applaud your leadership on this, Congressman HAYWORTH, I am hopeful the next time the President gets a bill from the House and Senate that he will do the right thing for the American people, help lower the cost, and make sure that the Federal Government is not dictating to people but providing services that cannot be provided by the private sector or State and local government.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania, and as we collectively and, indeed, as a new conservative majority within this chamber, move to bridge this credibility canyon, we can only do so by stretching out the hand of straight talk and truth.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on that point.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would gladly do so for my friend.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us talk about the truth. The truth is that two-thirds of the Federal budget entails entitlement spending and interest element of the national debt.

People probably do not realize this at home, but this year the interest payment on our national debt was almost \$300 billion. We spent more money paying the interest than we did on the entire Department of Defense. If a child is born in America today, 1995, if nothing changes up here, during their lifetime they will pay \$187,000 in Federal income taxes just to pay the interest element of the national debt.

This is serious stuff. Bill Clinton has never submitted a serious budget to balance, to get our future generations out of that problem. Let us look at the

budget that he did submit that still does not balance. In his budget, after 1996, Medicare premiums go up, and over a 7-year period they go up 89 percent.

That is something he does not want to tell Americans about. We are being honest. What we are trying to do is slow the growth of Medicare. We are going to increase spending every year on Medicare two-and-a-half times the inflation rate. Every year we will increase spending, but we will slow it down from 11 percent to about 6 or 6.5 percent. We are being honest with America, he is not being honest with America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think he makes a very valid and accurate observation. Indeed, if we were to move away from the metaphor of the ship of state and talk about the House of state, if you will, and make this President the custodian-in-chief, what, in essence, is going on is the equivalent of taking the dirt, trying to sweep it under the rug; taking all the debris and simply stuffing it underneath the couch, or within the cushions of the couch, and making things presentable for company coming in 1996. That company being the American citizens who go to the voting booth. Trying to put the best appearance on things instead of really getting down to cleaning up the place.

Now, I have to say, speaking from personal experience, and as my dear wife would bear out, I am not one of the greatest housekeepers on earth, but before my wife and family come back here on the rare occasions to visit in Washington, I know I better clean that house and get it ready. I better clean that apartment and get it ready. I cannot shovel the dirt off, I cannot just stuff the trash in amidst the cushions. What we have to do is make a fundamental change and a clean sweep of the idea of politics as usual.

More evidence of the credibility canyon. Each time I step into the well of this House, I think about those chief executives who have stood at this podium on truly historic occasions, both Republicans and Democrats. I think of Franklin Roosevelt on December 8, 1941, discussing the events of the previous day as a date which would live in infamy. I think of President Ronald Reagan coming back to address a joint session of Congress after a would-be assassin was unsuccessful in the attempt to take the President's life.

I also recall, as a private citizen, watching on television a newly-elected President who told us he was a new kind of Democrat; standing at that podium and lecturing the minority party at that time that he and his administration would only use numbers and only formulate budget projections on those figures supplied by the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, for those numbers were the most accurate.

Yet, I would refer my colleagues to this chart, because through the efforts

of this Congress, the President appeared not here at the podium but in a basically 5-minute live television insert casting about for a political solution for a genuine problem of governance, and he said we need to balance the budget in 10 years.

A funny thing happened between the time President Clinton stood at that podium and addressed a joint session of Congress and when he appeared in that brief television segment earlier in this 104th Congress. Somehow the President abandoned the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office. But, friends, these are the numbers. Mr. Speaker, these are the numbers the President said would be the most accurate.

As my good friend from South Carolina indicated, look what happens. Oh, yes, 1996, deficits below \$200 billion. The equivalent of trying to sweep something under the rug. But then, look, from 1997 through 2005, with the exception of 1998, when just barely the numbers are under \$200 billion, in essence we have \$200 billion deficits for another decade.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would gladly yield to my good friend from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have another distinguished Member of Congress about to join us here, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], who is a medical doctor. I want him to comment in a second about Medicare.

But when we look at those numbers, we see in the year 2005 we have a \$209 billion deficit. That is why no one in the Senate voted for it. But here is the important point about Medicare. He is using Medicare over and over again to justify his unwillingness to get serious about balancing the budget. Even in his 10-year budget that does not balance, Medicare premiums go up.

People need to understand, no matter what happens in this Congress, whether the President's plan is adopted, whether our plan is adopted, whether we do nothing, that part B of Medicare, which pays senior citizens' doctor bills, 31 percent of it comes from senior citizen premiums, the other 69.5 percent comes from the Treasury, no matter what we do, the premium part is going to go up. The question is how much it goes up.

There is a \$7 difference between our plan that balances in 7 years and the President's plan. That \$7 per senior citizen will allow us to balance the budget and save \$44 billion. But, more importantly, what we are doing is creating options to Medicare that will give senior citizens the same rights we have in Congress to choose medical plans that are more efficient, cheaper and more user friendly.

That is the key to Medicare reform, slowing the growth down and giving people options so that not only can we balance the budget, but we can take care of our senior citizens. Because if we do not slow the growth of Medicare

down, part A, the hospital part, is going to be broke in the year 2002. If the President wants to help senior citizens, help us save the trust fund part A.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman points up another aspect of the gulf that can only be described as the credibility canyon. How can this President claim to be a champion of Medicare when he is willing to cynically try to hold down the part B premium for the year 1996 only to have it rise again exponentially?

Mr. GRAHAM. The election year.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my good friend from the great State of Iowa, one of three freshman Members of the institution on this side of the aisle who is a physician.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on my colleagues' statements tonight about Medicare. I think it is very, very important that we get the facts out to our senior citizens. I think the Clinton mediscare campaign has reached a new low.

President Clinton says he is willing to shut down the Government to keep seniors from having to pay higher Medicare part B premiums. Why, then, I ask my colleagues, is he planning a 10.2-percent increase in part B premiums in 1997, right after the next Presidential election?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the gentleman from Iowa to repeat those numbers so that the Speaker and indeed the American people, who join us this evening, can hear this again. Would the gentleman please repeat what he just said?

Mr. GANSKE. Let me repeat these numbers.

President Clinton is planning a 10.2-percent increase in part B premiums in 1997. Is it not convenient that that is right after the next election?

Let me give Members some other facts, and these are facts. The Medicare part B premiums have increased 29 out of the last 30 years, since the beginning of Medicare. A fact: Medicare premiums have gone up every year since President Clinton was elected, a total increase since President Clinton was elected of \$14.30. Fact: Under our Medicare Preservation Act, in the year 2002, the Medicare part B premium would be \$87. Under the President's budget, the premiums would be \$83.

Mr. GRAHAM. So it is a \$4 difference.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is talking about shutting down the Government for a difference of \$4 a month.

But I think this is a point that is very, very important for our senior citizens to understand, because they are thinking, well, look, today I am paying \$46.10 a month for my premiums. Gee, that is quite a bit of an increase to go up that high. But what we also have to make sure that our senior citizens know is that that part B pre-

mium is deducted from their Social Security. Their Social Security is scheduled to increase over the next 7 years also.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, If I could just interrupt the gentleman a moment, because I want to make sure I understand this point and, indeed, so the Speaker and others joining us tonight can understand.

When there is this rise, which is proportional, the proportion stays constant. What the gentleman is saying is cost-of-living adjustments will help seniors absorb that cost.

Mr. GANSKE. Exactly. If I were a senior citizen, and I were only seeing the figures, gee, it is \$46 now and it is going to be 80-some dollars in the year 2002, that would worry me also. But what senior citizens also have to keep in mind is that there will be annual cost-of-living increases for their Social Security during that period of time.

□ 2115

So in essence, the difference between what we are proposing and what the President, projected, is proposing is a small difference. And we are talking about shutting down the Government for that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Two points we need to bring out at this juncture, because again some people may have missed the entire reason we enjoined this Medicare reform topic to begin with. Contrary to the very interesting fictions and political theater emanating from the other side, this has nothing to do with the issue of tax cuts.

The reason we were prompted to take action, as a new conservative, responsible majority here to help govern is the conclusion of the Medicare trustees in a report issued April 3 of this year. The Medicare trustees, a bipartisan group, including three of President Clinton's own Cabinet officers, Secretaries Rubin, Reich, and Shalala, signed off on this language, "the present financing schedule for the program is sufficient to ensure the payment of benefits only over the next 7 years." So a 7-year window to make reforms.

But here is the other topic and the other key thing that we must bring out at this juncture, because, again, in the confusion that has resulted on this other side, some folks have gone out and put on television ads that can only be described as fiction.

The fact is, we have repeated it, mentioned it once tonight, but it bears repeating, the average expenditure per Medicare beneficiary will increase from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002. That is an increase. That is not a cut.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think this is a fair statement of what the American public is going to have to come to grips with and really see what we want in this country. Medicare, trust fund A, is funded by wage withholding from your children and your

grandchildren. If it continues to grow at the rate that it is growing at 11 percent a year, we are going to have to do one of two things. Triple payroll taxes in the next 10 years on your children or grandchildren, and I think most senior citizens find that to be unacceptable. The other option is to increase spending on Medicare every year but at a slower rate. The President's plan saves 89 billion from slowed growth, but it does not affect part B. It does not have an institutional reform.

What we do is we slow the growth down to about 6 percent, increasing spending every year, and create options for traditional Medicare that will allow senior citizens to be well taken care of and save money for future generations, because you cannot balance the budget until you reform entitlements. It is physically impossible. If you took away the entire discretionary budget, you could not get there.

Under President Clinton's plan, he increases Medicare premiums every year. It is going to happen. But under our plan, it happens in a managed way with options that may save senior citizens money with a view of balancing the budget. There is a rhyme, a reason to what we are doing. We are serious; he is not. He wants to get reelected. I want to change America.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress last November, I was a physician, practicing in Des Moines, IA. I took care of lots of Medicare patients. My wife is a family physician who takes care of many senior citizens. I have parents who are on Medicare. And I can tell you that the reason we are doing this is to make sure that our senior citizens, my parents, my past patients, continue to receive good quality medical care. If we allow the system to continue the way that it is now, we are facing, according to the trustees' report, breakdown in 6 years. We cannot bury our heads in the sand.

The Health Care Financing Administration for the last 10 years has realized this and has increasingly tightened the bureaucratic tourniquet.

Well, folks, the tourniquet can help stop the hemorrhage for awhile. But the tighter that that tourniquet is applied, the day comes when you have strangulation. And what we are attempting to do with our Medicare plan is to create options for senior citizens that will provide good quality care, that will give them choices that they have not had before, where we still increase the amount of money that we are spending at two times the inflation rate, the same thing that President Clinton just a couple years ago said he was for.

So I think that, you know, there has been an awful lot of hot air blown on this issue. It is time that we get these facts out to our senior citizens.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, the credibility canyon only widened in the past couple of days when the President, listening to his polster and his political

consultant, decided to reinvent himself in the image of the saviour of Medicare, when in essence, as we heard the cold hard facts from the physician, facts borne out, not out of fear mongering but out of compassion that this gentleman who has worked on the front lines of the medical industry, we know that the President's arguments are essentially fictional.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, my good friend, author of the Shays act. What seemed to be revolutionary here in this country, that Congress people should live under the same laws as every other American, our good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that this law would not have passed if it had not been for the gigantic support of all the new Members of Congress. I was listening to what you had to say and felt compelled to come here because as someone who worked on Medicare and Medicaid on the Committee on the Budget, I know that we are saving the program. I know we are helping to slow the growth of spending. I also know that we have no new copayment or an increase in the copayment, no new deductible or increase to a deductible. The premium stays at 31.5 percent. I know you all have mentioned that, but the key point is to know the Government still is paying 68.5 percent. President Clinton has decided that he wants it to drop down in the election year to 25 percent and actually have people pay less premiums next year in the election year. Then they go up just as ours go up as the cost of the program continues. But the interesting point is, his 25 percent of the higher increase in cost ultimately means that the difference between our two programs is only \$4.70 each month. I make this point that I know has been made a number of times but I want to emphasize it, we are going to spend 73 percent more in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7 years. We are going to spend \$674 billion of new money in Medicare. And on a per-person basis, we are going to spend, as you have pointed out, I want to emphasize it again, \$4,800 to \$6,700 per beneficiary. Only in this country and in this city when you spend more money do people call it a cut.

The amazing thing is, you mentioned the polls, the President is listening to the polls. I had people say, are you not concerned about the polls? If President Lincoln had listened to the polls, we would not be one nation under God, indivisible. We would be two nations.

There is a point where we just have to be willing to take on the special interests, who are willing to distort the information, and talk to the American people, tell them the truth. You tell them the truth and they will have you do the right thing. But polls are being pushed aside and a lot of Members, particularly on this side of the aisle, are willing to take on those special interests to save Medicare and also make

sure that our children are not going to have to pay these horrendous debts.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I notice we have a new Member here.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I was going to say, such an honor to have with us the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who spent a good bit of time using special orders to help, I believe, shape the new majority.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am unaccustomed to speaking from this podium. You immediately want to begin uttering liberal platitudes when you stand here. But the fact is, I have been watching the distinguished gentlemen talking about Medicare for the last little while. I want to congratulate you for what you are doing to make the American public better informed about these issues.

It is kind of tragic, sad, and almost pathetic that the Democratic Party, that can take some justifiable pride in having created Medicare some years ago, have now resorted to medicare as the way of proceeding, as though making older people fearful is a substitute for having no policy. And it is really, I think, a true tragedy because that is really what you have happening here.

You have a party that has nothing to say on the subject and, in fact, is doing things that are very harmful to older people. The vote on the floor today, where the question was whether or not we would divest the pension funds of older people in this country in order to keep spending debt money in the United States, the Democratic Party voted overwhelmingly to go ahead and spend the money. That is not their money to spend. This is money that has been contributed by people to provide for their own retirement. And the Democrats said, go ahead and divest it, throw it away. That also comes on the heels of a plan that has been promoted primarily by Secretary Rubin which is aimed at taking the pension funds that have been contributed to companies across the country and invest those in very scary public housing projects.

Now, these are things that are happening out there that are really an assault upon senior citizens and meantime you have a party that then comes forward and conducts a medicare campaign aimed at trying to make older people fearful about what might happen in Washington to their Medicare cuts.

We are trying to make that system solvent. We are trying to get rid of the gimmicks. Trying to get rid of excuses and make certain that we have a solvent system for people to depend upon for the future, and all we get is scare tactics. It is pathetic.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, once again, mention was made of this vote. And somehow it may be missed by some folks in the media, but we need to again point this out. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that the new minority overwhelmingly voted to raid the trust fund, here are

the numbers: 177 Members of the minority party voted to basically say to the executive branch, to the Secretary of the Treasury and others in the executive branch, sure, go ahead, take the trust funds. Spend them to keep the Government in business. Only 18 Members, only 18 Members of the new minority were confident to help us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you how scary that vote really was. I was in a meeting today and heard the Secretary of the Treasury say that as of tomorrow he intends to begin divesting the trust fund, primarily the retirement trust fund of Federal workers. And so this was not simply some meaningless vote. This was in fact a real signal to the Secretary of the Treasury to go ahead and begin to take the money contributed by Federal employees for their retirement and spend it for all things that the Federal Government is doing.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

I welcome to this special order the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to thank my friend from Arizona for having this discussion of where we are at. I was watching on C-SPAN, and I thought I would come over and report firsthand, having been in a meeting with the President last night and having tried to understand exactly what the administration's real objections are. I think that if you take the Congressional Budget Office scoring of the President's budget over the next 7 years, you can begin to understand what the real difference is.

Over the next 7 years, President Clinton would spend \$625 billion more in noninterest outlays. His budget, his Government would spend \$625 billion more than our balanced budget act that we will be voting on this week. Because he would be spending a lot more, his interest outlays over the next 7 years would be \$252 billion higher. That is, we would be in a situation where we as taxpayers would be paying \$252 billion more in taxes in order to help finance \$625 billion more in spending under the Clinton administration program.

Our taxes would be at least 133 billion higher. And as you pointed out, and this is, frankly, this is the chart that got me to come over here. I do not think I have done a special order this year. I was watching you with this chart and the title has caught exactly what America is living through. We have a President who always has an explanation for what he wished he had done. He told Larry King he would balance the budget in 5 years when he was a candidate. He told all of us he wanted to reform welfare. Change welfare as we know it. That was his campaign slogan. He said we could balance the budget in 5 years, then 10, then 9, then 8, then 7. Then he said, well, really not 7, certainly not 7 the way we understood

it, not 7 if you have to actually keep score. But he would do it in 7, if he did not have to keep score. Here are the numbers.

As you point out, the Congressional Budget Office took his numbers, and this is the Congressional Budget Office, you remember, are the people the President stood right up there and told us in his first State of the Union we should use. I think you have already gone through this once.

□ 2130

But I just wanted to drive home for people who are listening when the President says he has set up a balanced budget, it is factually not true. The facts are under the President's budget the deficits would be as follows:

In 1996 \$158 billion, \$180 billion in 1997, 146—this is the CBO scoring—\$146 billion in 1998, slightly different numbers than you have because of the way this is done in this particular version.

But the net effect is in the last year, after all the President's work, after all the President's work, after all of his promises, and as you see right down here, 2002, which is the seventh year when we get a balance, in this seventh year the President runs a \$209 billion deficit. It is almost \$1,000 for every American, deficit, \$1,000 more debt for our children, for every child in the country.

Now I say that because what the real fight is about this week is that President Clinton wants to continue to spend more money, to borrow more from our children, to have more bureaucrats in Washington, to have more power over our lives, and I just conclude with this, and I appreciate so much your letting me come over and yielding to me:

The continuing resolution that we sent down yesterday which would have kept the Government open; we would have none of these problems today if the President signed it. That continuing resolution was our downpayment on a balanced budget. It said we know we cannot get there all at once, but at least we can start doing the right thing by our children. It was for 18 days.

To show you the difference between the House and Senate Republicans and the Clinton administration, in 18 days we saved \$3 billion compared to what President Clinton wanted to spend, and after all this malarkey about Medicare I said to him last night, "If we take it out, would you sign it?"

He said, "No, you don't let us spend enough."

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the Speaker repeat that again what the President told you?

Mr. GINGRICH. Clinton administration said; Chairman Panetta said, and directly the President concurred; no, they would not sign the continuing resolution if they took out Medicare. That was only the public-relations political argument. The fact was we do not let them spend enough money in the next 18 days. We actually say to them for 18

days you are missing \$3 billion you wanted to spend. We save for our children \$3 billion, and they just could not stand the idea that our children might have that \$3 billion when they wanted their bureaucrats to have it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I just want to add here one point, too:

Not only does he want to spend more, but now he wants to go to a source. Listen to what he wants to do to make sure that he cannot spend more because we are putting pressure on him.

What BOB WALKER said is true. For all those that are listening out there today, the President is intending to go for the Social Security trust fund, money for your retirement, money for my retirement, borrow money out of that fund to feed his spending habits, and that is what he is going to do, and we are trying to stop him. Please do not let him do that.

If we were in private business, and we borrowed money from our pension plans to run our businesses, we would go to jail. That needs to stop.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our friend from California.

Mr. BAKER of California. Thank you very much, Mr. HAYWORTH. I have had about 16 to 1 calls in the last few days saying hang in there, let us make this right for my kids and their kids, but a couple of people have been fooled by this comment that we are going to raise premiums on Medicare and cut Medicare. Would you please address that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. GINGRICH. If my friend would yield to me for just 1 minute, again I do not know what to say to my colleagues when the President of the United States and his senior staff deliberately, knowingly, mislead the American people.

I just watched—I did the "NewsHour" tonight, and immediately after I was interviewed by Jim Lehrer, they had the head of the Budget Office down there, Dr. Rivlin, a very knowledgeable woman who talked about severe cuts in Medicare.

Now I just want all of my colleagues to understand the numbers for a second, and I challenge any, any, liberal Democrat, to explain how this can be called a cut. This year we spend \$4,800 per senior citizen on Medicare. At the end of our 7-year program to save the Medicare trust fund we spend \$6,700 per senior citizen on Medicare. Now remember there are more retirees because more people retire each year, people live longer, so the actual increase in Medicare spending is 45 percent more spending on Medicare over the next 7 years, which is twice the inflation rate.

Now, if you are going to spend \$4,800 this year, and it is going to go to \$6,700 at the end of our 7-year plan, that is a \$1,900 per senior citizen per year increase. For the life of me I do not understand how somebody can get up, an official of the U.S. Government, look into the TV camera and use the term

"severe cut" when referring to a \$1,900 per senior citizen increase.

Mr. BAKER of California. But then you do that by raising premiums then; is that right?

Mr. GINGRICH. No, but in fact do not raise premiums, which is the other great baloney, and again my good friend from Connecticut was showing me some numbers that are so spectacular and so different from what the President has been saying and what the President's staff has been saying that I really think he should share them with the House because these really help us understand what a total campaign of misinformation this has been.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, if the gentleman will yield, I just would point out that the premium that we pay now is \$46.10, and the President has decided that he is going to lower the premium to \$43.70 per month, and then, after the election, it goes up to \$48, to \$53, to \$59, to \$67, to \$74, to \$82, and the 7th year the President's premiums go to \$82, and ours are at \$87, a difference of \$4.80, and if I could just say, when we get to this issue of what is a cut, the administration says we are cutting the earned income tax credit; that is going from \$19 billion to \$27 billion. They say we are cutting the School Lunch Program, but that is going up from \$6.3 billion to \$7.8 billion. They say we are cutting the student loan, and that is going from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, a 50-percent increase in student loans. They say we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid. It has gone from \$89 billion to \$124 billion. They say we are cutting Medicare, and it is going from \$178 billion to \$273 billion.

In every instance there is a significant increase.

Mr. BAKER of California. It was just mentioned to increase spending, and I am embarrassed to say this as a conservative Republican, but over the next 7 years, as we balance this budget, we are going to increase spending by \$3 trillion and add to the national debt a trillion. Is that true?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield to me, I want to point out to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] we have been accused on this floor though of increasing spending in one area. I have heard it in the well on several occasions. They have been saying we are increasing spending in defense, despite the fact that we are actually going to spend less on defense next year than we spent this year, so that when you spend less next year than you spend this year, well, I thought it was a cut, but they are saying it is an increase. But yet we are spending over what we spent this year; they are saying that is a cut.

It seems to me that we probably have some really weird economics and mathematics for that matter that is taking place at this moment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I was just going to say, if the gentleman would yield, the only possible mathematical operations at work are akin to something Orwellian.

We recall the noted British author, George Orwell, in his book "1984": Ignorance is strength, all the different observations in Orwellian Newspeak, and in the new mathematics, within this Beltway, and especially on this side of the Chamber, an increase is a cut and a cut is an increase. It adds up to this new international symbol that really deserves a place in our policy Pantheon, the international symbol for Stop Whining.

I defer first, if I could, to the physician, our good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Thank you. I think that for our listeners we need to, and the citizens, we just need to reinforce what people talk about and how people in Washington call cuts, what they call cuts.

If somebody would earn \$20,000 as their salary this year, but next year they would earn \$22,000, most people would say that is an increase. However in Washington it is very possible that that would be called a cut because it is less than a hypothetical projected increased to \$23,000.

That is what we have to explain to our citizens when we are back in our districts because they hear the word "cut," they hear the word "cut," and really what we are talking about in the Medicare area is we are talking about a slowing hypothetical rate of growth to twice the rate of inflation, almost more than anything else that we are doing in our budget, because our priority is to continue to provide quality health care, and that is the reason why in this area we are spending more at a faster rate than just about any other part of our budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I would recognize now our good friend from California.

Mr. BAKER of California. Thank you, Mr. HAYWORTH. It is very important, and I was rather shocked to see the President close down the Government. This work stoppage has occurred in 1984, 1987, 1990. Always the employees have been paid, but for the President of the United States to shut down the Government and declare that 800,000 of our loyal, hard-working Federal employees are nonessential sends a really strange message to the taxpayers who are paying for all this government.

Do you have any thoughts on that?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I do, and I defer first to our good friend from South Carolina for his observation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us put it in perspective. The reason he is giving and preaching is that he wants to take care of American senior citizens, and in the process of saying that he intends very soon to go into your Social Security trust fund and borrow the money out of that fund to fund his spending habits. If we did that in the private sector, you would go to jail. He is trying to tell you that I am saving you from a premium increase when his own budget after the election year has a 10-percent

premium increase in over a 7-year period. There is \$4 difference between what our plan does and what his plan does.

He is trying to sell you a bill of goods. Beware of Bill Clinton, senior citizens.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] who puts it very succinctly, and again it bears repeating what transpired on this floor today, H.R. 2621. The overwhelming majority of the liberal guardians of the old order said to the President and to his Secretary of Treasury in effect, "Go ahead, raid the Social Security trust fund even as you stand before the American public and claim to be the defender of America's seniors because, after all, we're bound to find some sympathetic ears in the media and because it will be so greatly repeated, it will inspire confusion. So go ahead and do that."

How crass, how shameful, how political. Friends, we were sent to Washington to change business as usual, no more excuses, no more gimmicks.

And to those who write and say, "Gee, why don't you just go and send in a clean CR?" let me make this observation. The difference comes in philosophy, not in procedure. Just as we are constrained to speak in legislative style here in the House, just as we observe convention with the rules of the House, so too do we make use of legislative tools at our disposal to implement the changes needed.

I defer to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Anybody who hears the term "clean CR" ought to understand that a clean continuing resolution is a dirty deal for future generations.

Mr. SHAYS. I would just love to weigh in, if I could. I know we are running out of time, but the bottom line is my heart goes out to the Federal employees about whether there is a shut-down, but this is far bigger than Federal employees. This is an issue of whether, once and for all, we are going to get our financial house in order, and balance our budget, save our trust funds and change and transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society.

□ 2145

That is what this battle is about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut, and indeed, I thank all of my colleagues.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we would simply make this point. Even as our chief executive or campaigner in chief prepares to leave this Nation, as we understand he is planning to do, to go to Japan, again Mr. Speaker, we extend the President of the United States a hand to say, "Enough posturing. Let's join together and govern." That is the central issue.

Even as our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, made the point, it is worth noting this. We are not playing a game.

Mr. BAKER of California. One last comment and the most important thing to remember tonight; that is, regardless of when, whether it is tonight, tomorrow night, or the next night, we are not going to pass anything that exceeds the budget line that will balance us by 2002. We are going to pass the Balanced Budget Act of 1996, and we are going to do it this week or next week, and we are not going to exceed that balanced budget line.

Mr. HAYWORTH. For it is our mission to balance the budget and change the philosophy of taxing and spending, and interesting interpretations that have to be called fictional offered by the cynical guardians of the old order.

NOW, FOR THE REST OF THE STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here tonight. I am going to be joined by several of my colleagues on the Democratic side. I guess, as Paul Harvey would say, we would like to tell you the rest of the story, because for the last hour we have heard what best could be described as maybe *Lost in Space*, or *Fantasies of the Unknown*, or something like that.

However, I think perhaps what is good for the American people is that we will have an opportunity to give the perspective from those of us who are in the minority here, those of us who are interested very much in moving the Government and the society forward.

I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] who is here tonight, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR]. We are going to spend the next hour talking about a few things.

I want to start off by talking about efficiency and the ability of Congress to do its work, because I am a Member of the 103d Congress. I was a freshman last year, as was the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN]. The message that we received when we were elected is that the American people did not want business as usual. They wanted Government to work, they wanted Congress to come and do its job. Frankly, that is exactly what we did last year, especially, especially when it came to the appropriations bills.

Today is November 14, 1995. The House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate had completed and sent to the President and had signed into law 3 of 13 appropriation bills. For those of you who do not know, we are required by law to complete the 13 appropriation bills basically by October 1 of each year.

Many times what happens is there is a continuing resolution that permits Congress, in essence, to grant itself a